



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,247	02/22/2007	Avelina Pardo-Blazquez	P18132-US1	5534
27045	7590	11/03/2009		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024				
EXAMINER				
SETO, JEFFREY K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2458				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/03/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/595,247

Applicant(s)

PARDO-BLAZQUEZ ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey Seto

Art Unit

2458

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Arguments presented are not persuasive (see continuation sheet).
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Joseph E. Avellino/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2458

Continued from (11): Applicant's arguments dated 10-12-09 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. While a copy of the claims was submitted, no changes were made to claims, thus the 10-12-09 filing has been considered a Request for Reconsideration.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Wettstein does not disclose Applicant's step of "carrying out a reverse generation" because two elements in Wettstein (the "service authorization identity", and the "user identity 380") have each been equated to Applicant's "master user's identifier". Applicant introduces the first "master user's identifier" in line 7 of claim 1, wherein the identifier identifies the user. The "user identity 380" of Wettstein was cited as teaching this limitation. Applicant introduces another "master user's identifier" in line 16, of claim 1, wherein the identifier is generated from a user's service indicator. The "service authorization identity" of Wettstein was cited as teaching this limitation. Applicant argues that the "master user's identifier" of line 7, is the same "identifier" that is in line 16, however, Applicant did not make such a distinction in claim 1, by using "the master user's identifier" in line 16. Wettstein discloses the equivalent of each claimed element. Further, the "service authorization identity" of Wettstein includes the "user identity 380" (See par. 46, lines 2-4).

Regarding Applicant's argument that Wettstein does not teach Applicant's step of "verifying the validity". Wettstein teaches a service authorizer 70 that authorizes the use of services in cooperation with a directory server 80 (See par. 32, lines 1-8). Wettstein further teaches a service authorization identity 540 that identifies services available to a user (See par. 44, lines 5-8). Finally, Wettstein teaches that the service authorization identity 540 can be used by the directory server 80 to find indicators of available services (See par. 55, lines 1-9). When the service authorization identity of Wettstein is entered in the directory server, the services indicated as being available to the user are, for all intents and purposes, "verified".